

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 13, 2002, claims 52 and 57 have been amended. Claims 47-60 remain pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

A. INTERVIEW

Examiner Arthur Duran and Primary Examiner James W. Myhre are thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives (Mr. Gatto and Mr. Blaise) during the personal interview on March 6, 2003. A summary of the substance of the interview was provided by Primary Examiner Myhre. *See* Interview Summary, Paper No. 7.

B. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (I.D.S.)

1. An electronic I.D.S. is being filed by Applicants on even date. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner consider the cited references and return a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission.

2. An I.D.S. is being filed herewith citing references made of record in prior U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/425,185, filed April 19, 1995. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.98(d), copies of the references cited on the Form PTO-1449 have not been provided, as this information was previously cited by or submitted to the Office in the prior 08/425,185 application. The

08/425,185 application is relied on for an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. §120. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the cited references and return a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission.

C. **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

Claims 52, and 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

1. With regard to claim 52, the Examiner alleges that the Specification fails to disclose a coupon including a "cookie." See Office Action, pg. 2, ¶3. Applicants have amended claim 52 to recite that the coupon includes a data component. As illustrated in FIG. 5, and disclosed in *at least* page 28, ll. 18-29 of the Specification, the coupon may comprise one or more fixed components (*e.g.*, border graphics, redemption instructions, user identification bar code, etc.), as well as one or more variable components (*e.g.*, expiration date, redemption amount, offer description, company/product information, item UPC number, associated UPC bar code, redemption address, etc.). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly sought.

2. With regard to claim 57, the Examiner alleges that the Specification fails to disclose the step of "the client requesting information from said subsequent server." See Office Action, pg. 2, ¶3. Applicants traverse. The Specification discloses various servers (*e.g.*, Internet web site, online service provider, etc.), each of which may comprise either a first, second, or

subsequent server, according to various embodiments. As one of many illustrative examples, the Internet web site illustrated in FIG. 1 may comprise a first server, online service provider (2) may comprise a second or subsequent server, and personal computer (6) may comprise a client. As disclosed in the Specification in *at least* pg. 24, ll. 8-24, a user may prepare a shopping list tailored to an individual retail store. Store-specific data may be downloaded from the online service provider (2) (*e.g.*, from the subsequent server). This comprises one example of a client requesting information from a subsequent server and as such, should not be viewed as limiting. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly sought.

3. With regard to claim 58, the Examiner alleges that the Specification fails to disclose a step wherein “the server receives a request for information from the client prior to establishing a connection over a communications channel between a client and a server.” *See* Office Action, pg. 2, ¶3. Applicants traverse. As disclosed in the Specification in *at least* pg. 19, ll. 4-14, a user may order a package of electronic coupons from the online service provider (2) via personal computer (6). Personal computer (6) may comprise the client. Upon receiving this request from the client, online service provider (2) may transmit the requested information to the personal computer (6). This comprises one exemplary illustration of a server receiving a request from a client. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly sought.

D. **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 47-51, 53-57, and 59-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,708,782 to Larson *et al.* ("Larson"). Applicants traverse. As discussed and agreed during the personal interview on March 6, 2003, and further acknowledged in the Interview Summary (Paper No. 7), Larson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *at least* the feature of having a second server system detect a coupon on a client system and redeem the coupon. For *at least* this reason, Applicants submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, teach all of the limitations of independent claims 47 and 57. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that dependent claims 48-56 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims, as well as for the further limitations they contain.

E. **INTERFERENCE**

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. As such, Applicants request that an interference be declared between the above-identified application, and U.S. Patent No. 6,076,069 to Laor.


CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC

By:


James G. Gatto – Reg. No. 32,694
~~Rick A. Toering – Reg. No. 43,195~~
Bradford C. Blaise – Reg. No. 47,429
Sean L. Ingram – Reg. No. 48,283
James J. Namiki – Reg. No. 51,148

Date: **April 11, 2003**

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC
12010 Sunset Hills Road
Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 464-4800 (Telephone)
(703) 464-4895 (Facsimile)